



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Southeast Sacramento County Agricultural Water Authority	<b>County</b>	Sacramento
<b>Project Title</b>	Ground Water Monitoring Program	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 96,900.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 96,900.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal monitors 32 existing wells and one proposed additional well to assess the status of the basin's groundwater elevations, groundwater quality, land surface subsidence and surface water and groundwater interactions, and maintains an on-going awareness of conditions and trends in response to management actions.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	4
Budget	2
Schedule	3
QA/QC	1
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>19</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The Applicant completed their final GWMP draft in October 2011 and is planning to formally adopt the document December 2012.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Applicant's Project Description is heavy on background information, providing much discussion of the monitoring "program," but little information delineating the proposed project, other than including a map showing one proposed monitoring well. The applicant very generally describes the GWMP as "providing a framework under which all users of the aquifer can move towards commonly held set of goals and objectives concerning groundwater use and protection...." without indicating what those specific goals and objectives are and how the proposed project relates to them. However, the Description supports that there is a need to establish a long-term groundwater monitoring network to guide groundwater management for the basin. The Applicant does not include an adequate description of the specific data, technical methods and analyses that will be used, but only very generally in an annual report containing information on "Groundwater levels and trends... [and] groundwater quality, land subsidence and surface water-groundwater interaction in the basin." The applicant does not provide enough detail on the proposed location and construction details of the proposed monitoring well or why it is needed. The Applicant indicates that collaboration between local public agencies has occurred through the development of the GWMP and that the program will coordinate with TNC and OC Davis to incorporate and analyze data from monitoring wells along the Cosumnes River to better understand the connection between groundwater and surface flows. The Applicant does not explain how ongoing use of the project product will occur, once grant funding is expended, or how ongoing effort will be funded, but describes only a monitoring duration of two years (pg. 10), within the time span of the grant.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Work Plan does not sufficiently document what will be done to accomplish the project as described in the project Description. For example, the project Description shows one new monitoring well is proposed for the monitoring well network, but the Applicant provides no detail in Task 1 describing the work or the steps involved; it merely states that "The program also proposes a new well to fill a special gap in the network." Also, the project Description describes that the project proposal "will assemble and maintain a database of groundwater information for the monitoring wells in the basin," but this task is not included in the Work Plan. In addition, Task 2 and Task 3 are not well described. For instance, the Applicant does not describe what water quality or land subsidence data will be collected or how this will be done (i.e., what water quality parameters, or what equipment used to measure land subsidence). The applicant does not present a sound strategy to evaluate progress and performance at each step. The Applicant does not assure that access to privately owned wells will be granted, and does not explain how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the involved stakeholders. Finally, the Applicant does not explain a plan for complying with CEQA for the proposed new well nor addresses any potential need for required permits.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **Budget:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Budget does not include sufficient detail to show that the proposal is cost effective. Budget details for the sub-consultant are not documented; only lump sums for labor and equipment for the new monitoring well installation. No explanatory text is provided to allow an understanding of how the budget was derived and whether it is realistic. The Budget indicates that data collection and reporting will occur for five years whereas the Schedule indicates a two-year duration.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Schedule shows that the Applicant plans to install the single monitoring well immediately upon issuance of the grant agreement, and will complete the monitoring and reporting within the required performance period, but it provides no narrative to support that it will be ready to proceed as indicated, for instance, in obtaining all needed permits or clearances, nor provides any explanation of timelines that are realistic for the work to be performed.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The applicant only briefly states that collection of groundwater data will be done in accord with protocols of DWR and other local agencies involved in groundwater monitoring in the basin, and no specific QA/QC measures are referenced. The Applicant provides no procedural assurances, such as review processes for quality of reports and data. The applicant provided no QA/QC assurances related to proper construction of the monitoring well. Finally, the Applicant provides no personnel qualifications, such as professional registrations, certification or experience, for individuals working on the project.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but not fully documented. The Applicant states that under their leadership it successfully completed a GWMP and that it was completed within the allowed budget and time frame (amended to account for temporary suspension of invoice payments by DWR). Although the Applicant submitted a final progress report for development of the GWMP, they did not provide information from the granting agency that corroborates that the funding agreement was well-managed by the Applicant.